

Remarks

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 2-10 and 12-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 21-24 are the independent claims.

Claims 2, 13, 21 and 22 have been amended. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Claims 2, 3, 7-10, 12, 13, and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102E as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0210771 (*Wood et al.*). Claims 4-6 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over wood in view of U.S. patent Publication No. 2003/0051026 (*Carter et al.*).

Independent claim 21 and 22 and depended claims 3 and 13 have been amended to emphasize the uniqueness of the present invention to overcome office rejections.

Independent claims 21 and 22 define two types of processes: an interaction process of communication between a client terminal and a server and internal process running only at the operating system of the server. According to the applicant the identification of the original user session is transferred to internal processes succeeding interaction processes.

Applicants respectfully submit that Wood et al. does not teach at least the aforementioned claim features, for at least the following reasons. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Wood et al.* and *Carter et al.* fails to disclose all of the features of the dependent claims.

In Wood the claim term "interaction" is describing access requests of a client entity to an information security system. For example, Wood et al. explains that "*In one utilization, session tokens are issued to client entities as part of **an interaction with the security architecture** and are thereafter presented with **access requests***" (*Wood et al.*, paragraph [0045]). The interaction is limited only to

session between the requesting entity and the information security information system. Wood fails to disclose associating between interaction process and internal processes for transferring the identify code of the original session for determining authorization levels at internal process running at the kernel level.

The claims as amended variously recite to the process operations which are a carried out at the operating system of the server. These operations are internal processes of the operating system, having no interaction with external entities. A novel aspect of the present invention as claimed is the ability to transfer the session ID between an external session that relates to interaction process with external entities and processes at the operating system level. *Wood et al.* limits the continuity only to interaction between the external entity and security information system, stating in paragraph [0045], that "[s]ession continuity means the maintenance of coherent session state across one or more interactions between an entity and an information environment".

"providing a persistent session in a networked information environment includes associating a unique session identifier with a **set of access requests originating from a client entity** and maintaining the unique session identifier across a credential level change" (*Wood et al.*, paragraph [0011]). This sentence exemplifies that the unique session identifier is maintained only through the interaction of access request between a client entity and information system, not relating to the process initiated by the access request and carried out in operating system of the information system.

The Office further cites " *In general, a wide variety of entities, including c users operating browser and/or non-browser client applications as well as automated agents and systems, may interact with enterprise applications and/or resources 190 and the security architecture as described herein.*" (*Wood et al.*, paragraph [0041]). This paragraph describes the type of entities which can interact with information security system according to *Wood et al.*; all these types of entities are external to the information security system. According to claims 22 and 21 as presently presented, at least some of the processes are internal operations running only within the server at the operating system level.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are patentably for reasons other than their base claims

Each of claims 2-10 and 12 to 20 and 25-28 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 21, 22 or 24 discussed above, and thus is patentable at least for the virtue of being dependent on a patentable base claim. Nevertheless, the applicant discusses the patentability of some of the dependent claims independently of the patentability of the base claims.

Amended Claims 3 and 13 continue to recite at least one agent installed on the at least one server, the agent enabling correlating between processes and sessions on different servers transferring identity code is between internal processes running on different servers. *Wood et al.*'s teaching that a gatekeeper and entry handler component 110 provides an entry point for **external client** applications **requesting access** to enterprise applications and/or resources 190, including e.g., information resources 191, 192 . . . 193, for which access management is provided by the security architecture at paragraph [0033] anticipates this claim feature. This explanation in *Wood et al.*, relates only to access requests of external clients to multiple enterprise application and not correlating between processes on different servers, which refers to interaction in between the servers of processes running in the operating systems of servers transferring identification code between internal processes. Absent is any teaching of correlating between processes and sessions on different servers. Applicants respectfully submit that this is another reason for which claim 3 and 13 are patentable over the cited art.

Claim 14 recites the following feature: "the association of the session identification code to the additional process comprises adding an identification code of the original session to the process information vector".

The Office acknowledges that the aforementioned feature is not disclosed by *Wood et al.* Nonetheless, the Office contends that paragraph [0432] of *Carter et*

al. discloses this feature arguing that that the matrix in Carter are equivalent to the vector in the applicant invention. The applicants respectfully disagree. This matrix is a central information source for all users and processes not part of the process information. Implementing a central matrix for all processes and users requires complex databases and algorithms for maintaining the this matrix, while the applicant unique method of using vector including the unique identification code a part of the process data provides enhanced solution which Carter fails to disclose.

Thus, *Carter et al.* does not disclose *adding an identification code of the original session to the process information vector*, as recited in claim 14. Rather, in *Carter et al.*, the identification of the parent process id (PID) is not inherited from the parent process and not added to the process vector, the identification is retrieved from a general file ("filename file") and stored in an identification matrix: ***"A process read routine strips away all process ids (PIDs) and parent process ids (PPIDs) from the filename file along with the user information, such as the UID--the owner of each process--from the filename file. Another process called matrix generation generates the process identification matrix from the information stored in the filename file."***(*Carter et al.*, paragraph [0340]).

Applicants respectfully submit that this is another reason for which claim 14 is patentable over the cited art.

The Claim 4 contains the aforementioned feature, in language pertaining to system. The applicant respectfully submits that this is another reason for which claim 4 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 5 and 15 contain the following feature: "the session identification code replaces redundant information in the process information vector". The Examiner did not consider this limitation for the second time; therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that no *prima facie* case of obviousness was presented against claim 5 or against claim 15 (see MPEP § 2143.03).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully

requested.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Michael Kondoudis/

Michael Kondoudis
Reg. No. 42, 758

**The Law Office
of Michael E. Kondoudis**
888 16th Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
202-349-9850